

2020

**Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**

Plans Review Subcommittee

**LEGAL ACTION REPORT**

**Thursday, April 30, 2020**

Pursuant to safe practices during COVID-19 pandemic, all in-person meetings are cancelled until further notice. The meeting was held virtually to allow for healthy practices and social distancing. The meeting was accessible at provided link to allow for participating virtually and/or calling in.

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Meeting called to order at 1:04 P.M., and per roll call, a quorum was established.

Commissioners Present: Terry Majewski (Chair), Michael Becherer Sharon Chadwick, Jim Sauer, Helen Erickson, Jill Jenkins and Jan Mulder.

Commissioners Absent/Excused: None.

Applicants Present: Michael Keith, Leo Katz, and Alex Enoch.

Staff Members Present: Michael Taku, Jodie Brown, Koran Manning, Dan Bursuck, Mallory Ress, and Nick Ross (PDSD).

**2. Approval of the Legal Action Report (LAR) from Meeting(s) of 3-12-20**

It was moved by Commissioner Chadwick, duly seconded by Commissioner Jenkins, and carried by a roll call vote of 7-0 to approve the Legal Action Report from the meeting of 3-12-20 as submitted.

**3. Historic Preservation Zone Review Cases**

*UDC Section 5.8/TSM 9-02.0.0/Historic District Design Guidelines/Revised Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*

**HPZ -20-004, 430 W 17<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Barrio Historico Historic Preservation Zone, Non-Contributing Resource**

Construction of a new 1,075 SF single story, single family residence with a 200 SF walled courtyard and one off street parking space.

Staff Taku summarized the project and read into the record the recommendation from the Barrio Historico Historic Zone Advisory Board (BHHZAB) from the meeting of 2-10-20.

Architect Leo Katz and property owner, Michael Keith presented the project. Presenters discussed the revisions to the plans following BHHZAB recommendations. The revisions included but were not limited to window style, building height, raised storage room parapet and building to be frame stucco vs. block.

Discussion was held. Subcommittee expressed concerns on proposed height not being compatible with existing contributing properties within the development zone; visibility of mechanical equipment from public view; window style and material; height and treatment of storage room; and opening on the front façade to the walled courtyard. Based on past precedent recommendations of wood frame stucco in the Barrio Historico Historic Preservation Zone (BHPZ), subcommittee had a consensus to recommend the building being wood frame stucco as proposed. Action was taken.

It was moved by Commissioner Sauer, duly seconded by Commissioner Becherer, and passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 7-0 to recommend continuing the case review, with the consent of the applicant and owner, to allow the applicant and owner to return with revised materials to address the concerns raised, in particular, the following:

- (1) building height within the stated Development Zone;
- (2) all windows, including the transom window above the front door, to be solid wood;
- (3) mechanical equipment must be screened from public view; and,
- (4) height and treatment of top of parapet for area labeled “storage” to match the rest of the building.

***Note: HPZ-20-005 and 006 were reviewed together, but separate motions were made regarding each case.***

**HPZ 20-005, 590 S Main Avenue**

**Barrio Historico Historic Preservation Zone- Non-Contributing Resource**

Construction of a new 1,440 SF single story, single family residence with a 200 SF walled courtyard and one off street parking space.

Staff Taku summarized the project and read into the record the recommendation from the BHHZAB from the meeting of 2-10-20.

Architect Leo Katz and property owner, Michael Keith presented the project. Presenters discussed the revisions to the plans following BHHZAB recommendations. The revisions included but were not limited to window

style, building height, raised storage room parapet and building to be wood frame stucco vs. masonry block.

Discussion was held. Subcommittee expressed concerns on proposed height not being compatible with existing contributing properties within the development zone; visibility of mechanical equipment from public view; window style and material; height and treatment of storage room; and opening on the front façade to the walled courtyard. Based on past precedent recommendations of wood frame stucco in the BHPZ, subcommittee had a consensus to recommend the building being wood frame stucco as proposed. Action was taken.

It was moved by Commissioner Sauer, duly seconded by Commissioner Becherer, and passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 7-0 to recommend continuing the case review, with the consent of the applicant and owner, to allow the applicant and owner to return with revised materials to address the concerns raised, in particular; the following:

- (1) building height within the stated Development Zone;
- (2) all windows, including the transom window above the front door, to be solid wood;
- (3) mechanical equipment must be screened from public view;
- (4) sliding patio doors on the north elevation visibility from public view; and,
- (5) changes to garage door to satisfy BHHZAB request.

#### **HPZ 20-006, 594 S. Main Avenue**

##### **Barrio Historico Historic Preservation Zone- Non-Contributing Resource.**

Construction of a new 1,440 SF single story, single family residence with a 200 SF walled courtyard and one off street parking space.

Staff Taku summarized the project and read into the record the recommendation from the BHHZAB from the meeting of 2-10-20.

Architect Leo Katz and property owner, Michael Keith presented the project. Presenters discussed the revisions to the plans following BHHZAB recommendations. The revisions included but were not limited to window style, building height, raised storage room parapet and building to be wood frame stucco vs. masonry block.

Discussion was held. Subcommittee expressed concerns on proposed height not being compatible with existing contributing properties within the development zone; visibility of mechanical equipment from public view; window style and material; height and treatment of storage room; and opening on the front façade to the walled courtyard. Based on past precedent recommendations of wood frame stucco in the BHPZ, subcommittee had a consensus to recommend the building being wood frame stucco as proposed. Action was taken.

It was moved by Commissioner Sauer, duly seconded by Commissioner Becherer, and passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 7-0 to recommend continuing the case review, with the consent of the applicant and owner, to allow the applicant and owner to return with revised materials to address the concerns raised, in particular; the following:

- (1) building height within the stated Development Zone;
- (2) all windows, including the transom window above the front door, to be solid wood;
- (3) mechanical equipment must be screened from public view;
- (4) sliding patio doors on the north elevation visibility from public view; and,
- (5) changes to garage door to satisfy BHHZAB request.

### **HPZ- 19-108, 521 S Russell Avenue**

#### **Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone, Contributing and Non-Contributing Resource**

Construction of an attached second dwelling unit at the rear of the lot.

Staff Taku summarized the project review history and read into the record the recommendation from the Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board (APHZAB) from the meeting of 1-21-20.

Alex Enoch, project designer from CAD Designs discussed the revisions to the plans following the previous APHZAB and PRS review comments. These revisions included but were not limited to massing, rhythm, proportion, doors and window style and materials, and perimeter wall height.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

It was moved by Commissioner Becherer, duly seconded by Commissioner Mulder, and passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 7-0 to recommend approval as presented and concurring with all recommended conditions of the APHZAB as stated in the LAR that was read into the record.

*Break: 2:33 PM*

*Return: 2:40 PM*

### **SIGN CODE REVISION TEXT CODE AMENDMENT**

PDSD staff Dan Bursuck presented an overview of the proposed amendments to the sign standards within UDC, related to historic provisions, in advance of the sign code sunset. Staff discussed findings from consultations with City of Tucson Historic Preservation Office staff, Sign Design Review Committee (SDRC), PRS and stakeholders who were involved in the HLS program. Proposed changes are detailed in a MEMO

to PRS and include but are not limited to: change the name of Historic Landmark Signs (HLS) program to Heritage Landmark Signs (HLS); remove language to allow signs to be relocated from outside city limits to Tucson and PRS to remain as the review authority.

PRS requested staff to return with an update after consultation with stakeholders and prior to Mayor and Council hearing.

PRS was generally supportive of the proposed amendment to the sign code as presented.

#### **4. Current Issues for Information/Discussion**

##### **a. Minor Reviews**

Staff provided an update on reviews conducted in Armory Park and West University. Next reviews are in the Barrio at 440- 446 S Convent Avenue (Roof/Fencing/Gate) and in; Armory Park at 63 and 69 E 13<sup>th</sup> Street (Roofing and Removable Accessible ADA Ramp).

##### **b. Appeals**

None at this time.

##### **c. Zoning Violations**

Staff provided information on ongoing and pending cases being worked on for compliance and/or in the review process.

##### **d. Review Process Issues/Discussions**

Discussions focused on the following: virtual meetings going forward until further notice; staff teleworking will continue; time of meeting; use of GoToMeeting vs. Zoom meetings; preference for applicants to present materials; applaud documents available online in one spot; include Advisory Board LARs with case materials; public comments to be read at meetings (if provided); staff to provide updates on PDSD Director's decisions.

#### **5. Summary of Public Comments (Information Only)**

No public comments were provided to staff.

7. **Schedule and Future Items for Upcoming Meetings**

The next scheduled meeting is May 14, 2020.

8. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 3:19 P.M.